

So we are faced with the good, the bad, and the ugly. But the question is: What should Congress do?

One choice before us, and it is, I hope, the choice we will take, is to consider a resolution of approval of this deal and to vote it down by an overwhelming majority.

What will this do?

It will demonstrate for the world that the American people, the American Congress, and future administrations are not morally or legally bound by this agreement. It will set the stage for a subsequent administration to demand that the limits on uranium centrifuges are continued well past year 10 of this agreement. So the current administration will take advantage of the good, we will suffer the bad, but in the future we will not have to deal with the ugly.

The second approach we can take is to consider a resolution of disapproval. Unlike a resolution of approval, a resolution of disapproval, if adopted, would have immediate legal effects under U.S. law. It would blow a hole in the deal. But as I will get to it, possibly the wrong hole and perhaps no hole at all. Because if we were to consider a resolution of disapproval, I think it would pass this House. I think it might get 60 votes in the other body. The President has already announced he will veto it. And then, as far as I can tell, we would not override the veto.

Now, this would have a similar legal effect to us voting down a resolution of approval. Overall, the majority of the House and the majority of the Senate would have voted to disapprove. But that last picture will be a picture of the proponents of this agreement winning by not losing more than two-thirds of the vote. That conveys in the most confused way the fact that this agreement will not be binding on future administrations and future Congresses.

There is, of course, the possibility that we somehow override a Presidential veto. That does not put us back where we were yesterday. That does not reinstitute sanctions. That does not create a good platform for creating a better deal, because by then many UN sanctions will be lifted. Our trading

partners in Europe will already be doing business. The President will have told the world that Iran is acting reasonably and Congress is acting unreasonably.

□ 1815

Under such circumstance, Iran would get the lion's share of sanctions relief. They would be denied some sanctions relief because U.S. law would remain in effect.

But Iran would have every excuse not to deliver the important good parts of this deal, not to ship their uranium stockpiles out of the country, not to decommission two-thirds of their centrifuges.

So if we pass over a Presidential veto, a resolution of disapproval, we have not blown up the deal and taken us back to where we had the deal.

Rather, we have created a circumstance where Iran has literally split the U.S. Government, with Congress pushing in one direction, the President pushing in another direction, and every nation in the world taking its cue from the President.

Instead, I suggest that we would be in a stronger position if we demonstrate to the world that Congress does not accept this agreement, it is not binding on the American people, the President may not be legally constrained for the remainder of his term in implementing this deal, getting us the good, suffering the bad, but knowing that the ugly is something that needs to be confronted by another administration.

It is another administration that needs to prevent Iran from claiming that it will have the right to unlimited centrifuges 10 years from now but, instead, demanding a renegotiation of this deal.

Finally, the sanctions relief promised in Vienna is relief only from those sanctions due to Iran's nuclear program. It is not a get-out-of-jail-free card. It is not a protection and a grant of authority to Tehran to engage in all kinds of evil activity in the Middle East and elsewhere.

If Iran continues to support Assad, we need to impose additional sanctions for that reason. If they continue to destabilize Yemen, we need to impose

sanctions for that reason. And we cannot give Iran a free pass just because they have entered into this particular deal. This is not rapprochement with Iran.

This is a deal that has, in its first year, the good and the bad and, in its 10th year, is so ugly that we have to demand additional negotiations.

When we make that demand, we need to make that demand in the voice of a President in a future administration who is determined to say that Iran can never have an unlimited number of centrifuges, Iran can never have an unlimited quality of centrifuges, Iran can never be a few days from a nuclear weapon, and that, in order to prevent that, we have the legal right to put all options on the table.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 179. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 143rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building".

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 14, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2620. To amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 15, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Visit to Thailand, Philippines, Hong Kong—January 4–12, 2015.											
Catherine Sendak .....	1/7	1/9	Thailand .....		488.25						488.25
	1/9	1/11	Philippines .....		533.97						533.97
	1/11	1/12	Hong Kong .....		493.68						493.68
Commercial airfare .....							14,665.50				14,665.50
Michael Amato .....	1/7	1/9	Thailand .....		488.25						488.25
	1/9	1/11	Philippines .....								
	1/11	1/12	Hong Kong .....		493.68						493.68
Commercial airfare .....							14,665.50				14,665.50